arXiv:hep-th/9404179v1 29 Apr 1994

NHCU-HEP-94-13

Classical N=2 W-superalgebras From Superpseudodifferential Operators

Wen-Jui Huang[1], J.C. Shaw[2] and H.C. Yen[1]

[1]Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University
Hsinchu, Taiwan R.O.C.

[2]Department of Applied Mathematics, National Chiao Tung University
Hsinchu, Taiwan R.O.C.

Abstract

We study the supersymmetric Gelfand-Dickey algebras associated with the superpseudodifferential operators of positive as well as negative leading order. We show that, upon the usual constraint, these algebras contain the N=2 super Virasoro algebra as a subalgebra when the leading order is odd. The decompositions of the coefficient functions into N=1 primary fields are then obtained by covariantizing the superpseudodifferential operators. We discuss the problem of identifying $N = 2$ supermultiplets and work out a couple of supermultiplets by explicit computations.

PACS: 03.40.-t, 11.30.Pb

I. Introduction

The relevance of the study of W-algebras in two-dimensional conformal field theory is now quite clear. The quantum W-algebras were first introduced by Zamolodchikov as extensions of the conformal symmetry[1]. Soon after this work it was realized that the classical W_n-algebras arise quite naturally as the exotic hamiltonian structures for the generalized KdV hierarchies[2-7]. These hamiltonian structures can be elegantly expressed by the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket defined by differential operators[8-10]. Extensions of the Gelfand-Dickey bracket for pseudodifferential operators give a class of W-type algebras called $W_{KP}^{(n)}$ which are the hamiltonian structures of the KP hierarchy [11-15]. Recently, the supersymmetric version of the second Gelfand-Dickey brackets were constructed[16-18]. A series of N=1 and N=2 W-superalgebras have been obtained from the brackets defined by superdifferential operators.

In this paper, we like to study the superalgebras arising from the second Gelfand-Dickey brackets defined by superpseudodifferential operators[19-22]. These superalgebras, to our knowledge, are still unexplored. Our main motivation comes from the fact that in the bosonic case all hitherto known W_∞-type algebras can be obtained from $W_{KP}^{(n)}$ and its "analytic contiuation" $W_{KP}^{(q)}$[23] via reductions, contractions or truncations[24]. Thus, we believe that the superalgebras from superpseudodifferential operators could possibly lead to an interesting super version of W_∞-type algebras. The first aim of this paper is therefore to find the $N = 2$ analogue of $W_{KP}^{(n)}$. To this purpose, we consider the usual reduction of these superalgebras. We find that it is possible when the leading order is a (positive or negative) odd integer. In other words, in this case these superalgebras contain the $N = 2$ super Virasoro algebra as a subalgebra. In order to see whether these superalgebras are genuine $N = 2$ W-superalgebras or not we need to identify the required $N = 2$ supermultiplets. This is a very difficult task. We know that in the cases of ordinary (pseudo)differential operators the desired primary fields can be easily obtained by putting the operators into a conformally covariant form[25,26]. But the superconformally

covariant form of superdifferential operators can only give us the decompositions of coefficient functions into $N = 1$ primary fields due to the fact that these super operators are defined on $(1|1)$ superspace[27,28]. The $N = 2$ supermultiplets can be identified only if we further compute the hamiltonian flow defined by the spin-1 current and redefine the $N = 1$ primary fields properly. The last step is where the difficulty lies since there is yet no systematical way to handle the spin-1 flow. Therefore these $N = 2$ supermultiplets have never been completely identified. Despite of this, we still carry out the superconformal covariantization program for the superpseudodifferential operators to get the series of $N = 1$ primary fields. Then we discuss the problem of identifying $N = 2$ supermultiplets. In fact, we show that the identification problem for the case of leading order $2m + 1$ is equivalent to that for the case of leading order $-2m - 1$. Moreover, two supermultiplets are identified by explicit computations.

We organize this paper as follows. In Sec.II. we introduce the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket for superpseudodifferential operators and show that a reduction yields $N = 2$ super Virasoro algebra if the leading order is odd. In Sec. III. we prove that the action of superconformal transformation on the superpseudodifferential operator is nothing but a hamiltonian flow defined by the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket. The superconformally covariant form of the superpseudodifferential operators is obtained. In Sec. IV. we identify first two $N = 2$ supermultiplets of the negative part of an odd-order superpseudodifferential operator. We present our concluding remarks in Sec. V..

II. Superpseudodifferential Operators and Second Gelfand-Dickey Bracket

We consider the superdifferential operators on a $(1|1)$ superspace with coordinate (x, θ). These operators are polynomials in the supercovariant derivative $D = \partial_\theta + \theta\partial_x$ whose coefficients are $N = 1$ superfields;i.e.

$$L = D^n + U_1 D^{n-1} + U_2 D^{n-2} + \ldots + U_n + U_{n+1} D^{-1} + \ldots \tag{2.1}$$

where n is a nonzero integer (could be negative). As usual, we assume that they are homogeneous under the usual Z_2 grading; that is, $|U_i| = i(\text{mod } 2)$. The bracket will involve functional of the form

$$F[U] = \int_B f(U) \tag{2.2}$$

where $f(U)$ is a homogeneous (under Z_2 grading) differential polynomial of the U_i's and $\int_B = \int dxd\theta$ is the Berezin integral which is defined in the usual way, namely, if we write $U_i = u_i + \theta v_i$ and $f(U) = a(u,v) + \theta b(u,v)$ then $\int_B f(U) = \int dx b(u,v)$. The multiplication is given by the super Leibnitz rule:

$$D^k \Phi = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} (-1)^{|\Phi|(k-i)} \Phi^{[i]} D^{k-i}, \tag{2.3}$$

where k is an arbitrary integer and $\Phi^{[i]} = (D^i \Phi)$ and the superbinomial coefficients $\begin{bmatrix} k \\ i \end{bmatrix}$ are defined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-i \end{bmatrix} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & for \quad i < 0 \quad or \quad (k,i) \equiv (0,1) \quad (mod \quad 2) \\ \begin{pmatrix} [\frac{k}{2}] \\ [\frac{k-i}{2}] \end{pmatrix} & otherwise \end{array} \right\} \tag{2.4}$$

where $\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}$ is the ordinary binomial coefficient. Next, we introduce the notions of superresidue and supertrace. Given a super-pseudodifferential operator $P = \sum p_i D^i$ we define its superresidue $sresP = p_{-1}$ and its supertrace as $StrP = \int_B sresP$ In the usual manner it can be shown that the supertrace of a supercommutator vanishes;i.e. $Str[P,Q] = 0$, where $[P,Q] \equiv PQ - (-1)^{|P||Q|} QP$ Finally, for a given functional $F[U] = \int_B f(U)$ we define its gradient dF by

$$dF = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (-1)^{n+k} D^{-n+k-1} \frac{\delta f}{\delta U_k}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\frac{\delta f}{\delta U_k} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{|U_k| i + i(i+1)/2} D^i \frac{\partial f}{\partial U_k^{[i]}}. \tag{2.6}$$

Equipped with these notions we now define the supersymmetric second Gelfand-Dickey bracket as

$$\{F,G\} = (-1)^{|F|+|G|+n} Str[L(dFL)_+ dG - (LdF)_+ LdG] \tag{2.7}$$

where $()_+$ denotes the differential part of a super-pseudodifferential operator. It has been shown that (2.7) indeed defines a hamiltonian structure: it is antisupersymmetric and satisfies the super-Jacobi identity[20-22].

When n is positive and when $U_{n+1} = U_{n+2} = \ldots = 0$ (i.e. when L is a superdifferential operator) it can be shown that when the constraint $U_1 = 0$ is imposed the induced bracket is well-defined only when n is odd[17]. The reason is that this constraint is second class when n is odd, while becomes first class for even n's. To compute these induced brackets, we need to modify at least one of dF and dG defined by (2.5) due to absence of U_1. The prescription is to add a term $D^{-n}V$ to, say, dG in such a way that

$$sres[L, D^{-n}V + dG] = 0 \tag{2.8}$$

We shall denote $X_G = D^{-n}V + dG$ for this choice of V. Replacing dG in (2.7) by X_G then gives the induced bracket. It has been shown that if we define (of course, only when $n \geq 3$)

$$\begin{aligned} T &= U_3 - \frac{1}{2}U_2' \\ J &= U_2 \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where $V' = (DV), V'' = (D^2V), \ldots$ etc, then T and J obey the $N = 2$ super Virasoro algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} \{T(X), T(Y)\} &= [\frac{1}{4}m(m+1)D^5 + \frac{3}{2}T(X)D^2 + \frac{1}{2}T'(X)D + T''(X)]\delta(X-Y), \\ \{T(X), J(Y)\} &= [-J(X)D^2 + \frac{1}{2}J'(X)D - \frac{1}{2}J''(X)]\delta(X-Y), \\ \{J(X), T(Y)\} &= [J(X)D^2 - \frac{1}{2}J'(X)D + J''(X)]\delta(X-Y), \\ \{J(X), J(Y)\} &= -[m(m+1)D^3 + 2T(X)]\delta(X-Y), \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where we have written $n = 2m+1$ and $\delta(X-Y) = \delta(x-y)(\theta-w)$.

The first natural question one can think of is whether or not the above result remains true when the superpseudodifferential operators are used instead. By straightforward calculations we can show that the answer is yes. In other words, as long as n is an odd integer T and J defined by (2.9) together obey the $N = 2$ super Virasoro algebra. What remains to be checked is if the required $N = 2$ supermultiplets can be defined as differential polynomails in the coefficient functions U_k's. To this end we need to consider the hamiltonian flows defined by the two linear functionals:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \int_B T\xi = \int_B (U_3\xi + \frac{1}{2}U_2\xi') \\ H &= \int_B J\zeta = \int_B U_2\zeta \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where $|\xi(x,\theta)| = |\zeta(x,\theta)| = 0$. We find that the transformations of L under the hamiltonian flows defined by G and H are

$$\begin{aligned} J(X_G) &\equiv (LX_G)_+L - L(X_GL)_+ \\ &= [\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D + \frac{(m+1)}{2}\xi'']L - L[\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D - \frac{m}{2}\xi''] \\ J(X_H) &\equiv (LX_H)_+L - L(X_HL)_+ \\ &= [-\zeta D - (m+1)\zeta']L - L[-\zeta D + m\zeta'] \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Since T is the super Virasoro generator, $J(X_G)$ is called the super Virasoro flow. If the expicit forms of (2.12) are known, one can read off the correponding brackets at once by using the formula:

$$J(X_F) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(-1)^{k|F|+1}\{U_k, F\}D^{n-k} \tag{2.13}$$

We shall prove in the next section that $J(X_G)$ in (2.12) is the infinitesimal form of the superconformal covariance of L.

III. Superconformally Covariant Form of L

In this section we like to give the super Virasoro flow $J(X_G)$ a geometrical interpretation and put L into a superconformally covariant form. We shall follow the construction

established in refs.[27,28]. Let us recall that on the (1|1) superspace with coordinate $X = (x, \theta)$. the most general superdiffeomorphism has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x} &= g(x) + \theta\kappa(x) \\ \tilde{\theta} &= \chi(x) + \theta B(x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $|g| = |B| = 0$ and $|\kappa| = |\chi| = 1$. The superdiffeomrphism (3.1) is a superconformal transformation if

$$D = (D\tilde{\theta})\tilde{D} \tag{3.2}$$

A function $f(X)$ is called a superconformal primary field of spin h if, under superconformal transformation, it transforms as

$$f(\tilde{X}) = (D\tilde{\theta})^{-2h} f(X) \tag{3.3}$$

We shall denote by F_h the space of all superconformal primary fields of spin h. As usual, a superpseudodifferential operator Δ is called a covariant operator if it maps F_h to F_l for some h and l.

We like to study the covariance property of

$$L = D^n + U_2 D^{n-2} + U_3 D^{n-3} + \ldots + U_n + U_{n+1} D^{-1} + \ldots \tag{3.4}$$

where we have set U_1 to be zero. Our aim is to see if some h and l can be found so that under superconformal transformation $X \longrightarrow \tilde{X}$

$$L(\tilde{X}) = (D\tilde{\theta})^{-2l} L(X) (D\tilde{\theta})^{2h} \tag{3.5}$$

As in the case of superdifferential operators the constraint $U_1 = 0$ determines both h and l[27,28]. In fact, simple algebras gives (for any nonzero n)

$$(\tilde{D})^n (D\tilde{\theta})^{-2h} = (D\tilde{\theta})^{-2h-n} (D^n + A_{n-1} \frac{D^2\tilde{\theta}}{D\tilde{\theta}} D^{n-1} + \ldots) \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$A_{n-1} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} m & (n = 2m) \\ -2h - m & (n = 2m+1) \end{array} \right\} \tag{3.7}$$

Thus, $U_1 = 0$ can be preserved under superconformal transformation only when

$$n = 2m + 1, \qquad h = -\frac{1}{2}m, \qquad l = \frac{1}{2}(m+1) \tag{3.8}$$

In summary, we have the covariance condition

$$L(\tilde{X}) = (D\tilde{\theta})^{-(m+1)} L(X) (D\tilde{\theta})^{-m} \tag{3.9}$$

The transformation laws for U_k's are then completely determined by (3.9). For example, simple computations yield the expected transformation laws of $J = U_2$ and $T = U_3 - \frac{1}{2}U_2'$:

$$\begin{aligned} J(X) &= J(\tilde{X})(D\tilde{\theta})^2 \\ T(X) &= T(\tilde{X})(D\tilde{\theta})^3 + \frac{1}{2}m(m+1)S(\tilde{X}, X) \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $S(\tilde{X}, X)$ is the superschwarzian defined by

$$S(\tilde{X}, X) = \frac{D^4\tilde{\theta}}{D\tilde{\theta}} - 2\big(\frac{D^3\tilde{\theta}}{D\tilde{\theta}}\big)\big(\frac{D^2\tilde{\theta}}{D\tilde{\theta}}\big) \tag{3.11}$$

It is interesting to note that the "central charge" $c_m = \frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$ in (3.10) does not change sign under the sign change of the leading order $n = 2m + 1$: $\quad m \longrightarrow -m - 1$. To understand this point, let us consider the pair of superpseudodifferential operators:

$$L^{\pm} = D^{\pm 2m \pm 1} + U_2^{\pm} D^{\pm 2m \pm 1 - 2} + U_3^{\pm} D^{\pm 2m \pm 1 - 3} + \dots \tag{3.12}$$

We shall take L^- to be the formal inverse of L^+, that is,

$$L^+ L^- = 1 \tag{3.13}$$

The most important point here is that (3.13) is invariant under superconformal transformation (3.9). The equality (3.13) has fixed the functional relations between U_k^+'s and U_k^-'s. In fact, expanding the left hand side of it yields

$$\begin{aligned} U_2^- &= -U_2^+ \\ U_3^- &= U_3^+ - (U_2^+)' \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} J^- &\equiv U_2^- = -U_2^+ \equiv -J^+ \\ T^- &\equiv U_3^- - \frac{1}{2}(U_2^-)' = U_3^+ - \frac{1}{2}(U_2^+)' \equiv T^+ \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

It is clear now why the central charge remains unchange under $n \longrightarrow -n$. We also like to point out that the brackets (2.10) is invariant under $J \longrightarrow -J$. So the first of (3.15) would not harm these brackets.

We like to show that the infinitesimal form of the covariance condition (3.9) is nothing but the Hamiltonian flow $J(X_G)$ defined by (2.11) and (2.12). First, we recall the most general infinitesimal form of superconformal transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x} &= x - \epsilon(x) - \theta\eta(x) \\ \tilde{\theta} &= \theta - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x\epsilon(x)\theta - \eta(x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $|\epsilon| = 0$ and $|\eta| = 1$. Defining $\xi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(x) + \theta\eta(x)$ we can show by induction that for nonnegative integer k [28]

$$(\tilde{D})^k = D^k + D[D^k, \xi]D + [D^k, \xi]D^2 + O(\xi^2) \tag{3.17}$$

If one reexamines the proof for this equivalence in the case of superdifferential operator given in ref.[28], one can easily recognizes that (3.17) is the key formula. Therefore, to generalize this proof to the present case we need only to prove the validity of (3.17) when k is a negative integer. To check the validity we start with $k = -1$. From $D\tilde{\theta} = 1 - \xi''$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}^{-1} &= D^{-1}(D\tilde{\theta}) \\ &= D^{-1} - D^{-1}\xi'' \\ &= D^{-1} - D^{-1}[D^2, \xi] \\ &= D^{-1} - D\xi + D^{-1}\xi D^2 \\ &= D^{-1} + D[D^{-1}, \xi]D + [D^{-1}, \xi]D^2 \end{aligned}$$

as desired. For $k < -1$ we can prove easily by induction. With the validity of (3.17) for arbitrary integer k the desired proof follows mutatis mutandi the one of ref.[28]. We therefore conclude that infinitesimal form of (3.9) is indeed the super Virasoro flow $J(X_G)$.

To covariantize the superpseudodifferential operators, we briefly review the necessary set-up[27,28]. First, we introduce a grassmanian odd function $B(X)$ which transforms under superconformal transformation as

$$B(\tilde{X}) = (D\tilde{\theta})B(X) + \frac{D^2\tilde{\theta}}{D\tilde{\theta}} \tag{3.18}$$

We then make the following identification:

$$T(X) = \frac{m(m+1)}{2}[D^2B(X) - (DB(X))B(X)] \tag{3.19}$$

Clearly, (3.19) defines nothing when $m = 0, -1$. This means that the covariantization program used here is not applicable to these two cases. As a matter of fact, it reflects that when the leading order is ± 1 no $N = 1$ primary basis can be defined. We can actually verify this claim via the direct method of construction used in ref.[18]. One should note that different $B(X)$'s may actually define the same $T(X)$ as long as its variation δB satisfies

$$(\delta B)'' - (\delta B)'B - B'\delta B = 0 \tag{3.20}$$

The transformation law of $B(X)$ enables us to introduce a covariant superderivative defined by

$$\hat{D}_{2k} \equiv D - 2kB(X) \tag{3.21}$$

One can verify easily that $\hat{D}_{2k}$ maps from F_k to $F_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}^l_{2k} &\equiv \hat{D}_{2k+l-1}\hat{D}_{2k+l-2}\ldots\hat{D}_{2k} \qquad (l>0) \\ &= [D-(2k+l-1)B][D-(2k+l-2)B]\ldots[D-2kB] \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

maps from F_k to $F_{k+\frac{l}{2}}$. Obviously, we also need the inverse operators of $\hat{D}^l_{2k} \quad (l>0)$, which are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}^{-1}_{2k} &\equiv (\hat{D}_{2k-1})^{-1} = [D-(2k-1)B]^{-1} \\ \hat{D}^{-l}_{2k} &\equiv \hat{D}^{-1}_{2k-l-1}\hat{D}^{-1}_{2k-l-2}\ldots\hat{D}^{-1}_{2k} \qquad (l>0) \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

With these definitions we have the following formulae:

$$\hat{D}_{2k}\delta B = -\delta B\hat{D}_{2k-1} + \triangle B \tag{3.24}$$

where δB is an *arbitrary* variation and $\triangle B \equiv D(\delta B) - B\delta B$;

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D}_{2k+1}\hat{D}_{2k}\delta B &= \delta B\hat{D}_{2k}\hat{D}_{2k-1}\\ \hat{D}^{-1}_{2k-1}\hat{D}^{-1}_{2k}\delta B &= \delta B\hat{D}^{-1}_{2k-2}\hat{D}^{-1}_{2k-1}\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where δB is subjected to (3.20). By using (3.21)-(3.25) we can derive (which were derived in refs.[27,28] only for positive m)

$$\delta_B\hat{D}^{2m}_{2k} = -\delta B(m\hat{D}^{2m-1}_{2k}) - \triangle B[m(2k+m-1)\hat{D}^{2m-2}_{2k}] \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$\delta_B\hat{D}^{2m+1}_{2k} = -\delta B[(2k+m)\hat{D}^{2m}_{2k}] - \triangle B[m(2k+m)\hat{D}^{2m-1}_{2k}] \tag{3.27}$$

Here δB is subjected to the constraint (3.20).

We now write the covariant form of L

$$\begin{aligned}L &= D^{2m+1} + U_2D^{2m-1} + U_3D^{2m-2} + \dots\\ &= \hat{D}^{2m+1}_{-m} + \Delta^{(2m+1)}_2(U_2,T) + \sum_{k=4}^{\infty}\Delta^{(2m+1)}_k(W_k,T)\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where W_k is a superconformal primary field of spin $\frac{k}{2}$ and

$$\Delta^{(2m+1)}_p(W_p,T) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{p,i}(\hat{D}^i_pW_p)\hat{D}^{2m+1-p-i}_{-m} \qquad \alpha_{p,0} = 1 \tag{3.29}$$

The coefficients $\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{p,i}$'s are determined by requiring that the right hand side of (3.29) depends on B only through T. In other words, they are solved from the recursion relations arising from the equations $\delta_B\Delta^{(2m+1)}_p = 0$. But since (3.26) and (3.27) are valid for all integers m, we expect that the recursion relations obtained for positive m[28] remain valid for nonpositive m. As a result, the formulae of $\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{p,i}$ for positive m remain valid for

nonpositive m. Therefore, without any calculations we have

$$\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{2p,2l} = (-1)^l \frac{\binom{l+p-m-1}{l}\binom{p+l-1}{l}}{\binom{2p+l-1}{l}}$$
$$\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{2p,2l+1} = \frac{(-1)^l}{2} \frac{\binom{p+l-m-1}{l}\binom{p+l}{l}}{\binom{2p+l}{l}} \tag{3.30}$$

and

$$\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{2q+1,2l} = (-1)^l \frac{\binom{q+l-m-1}{l}\binom{q+l}{l}}{\binom{2q+l}{l}}$$
$$\alpha^{(2m+1)}_{2q+1,2l+1} = (-1)^l \frac{m-q}{2q+1} \frac{\binom{q+l-m}{l}\binom{q+l}{l}}{\binom{2q+l+1}{l}} \tag{3.31}$$

Substitutions of (3.29)-(3.31) back into (3.28) give the desired decompositions of coefficient functions U_k's into differential polynomials in T and the $N = 1$ primary fields W_k's.

We have seen in this section that the generalization of the covariantization program established in refs.[27,28] to the case of superpseudodifferential operators is quite straightforward. Key formulae like (3.17), (3.26)-(3.31) remain unchanged at all.

IV. N=2 Supermultiplets

The existence of the $N = 2$ super Virasoro algebra (2.10) leads naturally to the conjecture that the $N = 1$ primary fields W_k's can be redefined in such a way that W_{2k} and W_{2k+1} $(k \geq 2)$together form a $N = 2$ supermultiplet; i.e. under the spin-1 flow $J(X_H)$ defined by (2.11) they transform as

$$\delta_\zeta W_{2k} = 2W_{2k+1}\zeta$$
$$\delta_\zeta W_{2k+1} = -kW_{2k}\zeta'' + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2k}\zeta' - \frac{1}{2}W''_{2k}\zeta \tag{4.1}$$

Since there is no simple way to handle this flow, it is even not clear whether or not this conjecture holds in general for superdifferential operators. Hence, we shall restrict ourselves to a very limited goal. We shall just consider the negative part of a superpseudodifferential operator of positive leading order $2m+1$ ($m>0$) and present a general observation on this problem.

First, we observe that

$$[J(X_H)]_\pm = [-\zeta D - (m+1)\zeta']L_\pm - L_\pm[-\zeta D + m\zeta'] \tag{4.2}$$

that is, the positive part L_+ and the negative part L_- transform independently under spin-1 flow. Therefore, it is possible to consider only the negative part. Secondly, since for a given $k>1$ U_{2m+k} is a function of T and W_{2m+l}'s ($k\geq l$) and since

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\zeta T &= [-JD^2 + \frac{1}{2}J'D - \frac{1}{2}J'']\zeta \\ \delta_\zeta J &= [m(m+1)D^3 + 2T]\zeta \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

$\delta_\zeta W_{2m+k}$ must depend only on J, T and W_{2m+l}'s ($k\geq l$). As a result, the possible redefinition of W_{2m+k} is of the form

$$\bar{W}_{2m+k} = W_{2m+k} + f_{2m+k}(J, W_{2m+1}, W_{2m+2}, \ldots, W_{2m+k-1}) \tag{4.4}$$

where f_{2m+k} is a differential polynomial. For instance, based on the dimensional consideration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{W}_{2m+2} = W_{2m+2} \qquad\qquad \bar{W}_{2m+3} = W_{2m+3} \\ &\bar{W}_{2m+4} = W_{2m+4} + aJW_{2m+2} \\ &\bar{W}_{2m+5} = W_{2m+5} + bJW_{2m+3} \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

It follws immediately from (4.5) that W_{2m+2} and W_{2m+3} must form a $N=2$ supermultiplet if it exists at all. In the following we verify that this is indeed true and determine the values of a and b which make $\bar{W}_{2m+4}$ and $\bar{W}_{2m+5}$ form a $N=2$ supermultiplet.

Using (3.30), (3.31) and the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}^2_{2k} &= D^2 - BD - 2kB' \\ \hat{D}^3_{2k} &= D^3 - (2k+1)BD^2 - (2k+1)B'D - 2kB'' + 4k(k+1)BB' \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{D}^{-1}_{-m} &= D^{-1} + (m+1)BD^{-2} - (m+1)B'D^{-3} - [(m+1)B'' + (m+1)^2B'B]D^{-4} + \dots \\
\hat{D}^{-2}_{-m} &= D^{-2} + BD^{-3} - (m+2)B'D^{-4} + \dots \\
\hat{D}^{-3}_{-m} &= D^{-3} + (m+2)BD^{-4} + \dots \\
\hat{D}^{-4}_{-m} &= D^{-4} + \dots
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.7}
$$

we easily compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^{(2m+1)}_{2m+2}(W_{2m+2}, T) &= W_{2m+2}D^{-1} + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+2}D^{-2} - \frac{1}{2}W''_{2m+2}D^{-3} + \dots \\
&\qquad - [\frac{m+2}{2(2m+3)}W'''_{2m+2} + \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}TW_{2m+2}]D^{-4} + \dots \\
\Delta^{(2m+1)}_{2m+3}(W_{2m+3}, T) &= W_{2m+3}D^{-2} - \frac{1}{2m+3}W'_{2m+3}D^{-3} - \frac{m+2}{2m+3}W''_{2m+3}D^{-4} + \dots \\
\Delta^{(2m+1)}_{2m+4}(W_{2m+4}, T) &= W_{2m+4}D^{-3} + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+4}D^{-4} + \dots \\
\Delta^{(2m+1)}_{2m+5}(W_{2m+5}, T) &= W_{2m+5}D^{-4} + \dots
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.8}
$$

The desired decompositions then can be read off from (4.8):

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{2m+2} &= W_{2m+2} \\
U_{2m+3} &= W_{2m+3} + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+2} \\
U_{2m+4} &= W_{2m+4} - \frac{1}{2m+3}W'_{2m+3} - \frac{1}{2}W''_{2m+2} \\
U_{2m+5} &= W_{2m+5} + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+4} - \frac{m+2}{2m+3}W''_{2m+3} - \frac{m+2}{2(2m+3)}W'''_{2m+2} \\
&\qquad - \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}TW_{2m+2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.9}
$$

Next, we find the spin-1 transformations of $U_{2m+2}, \dots, U_{2m+5}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
[J(X_H)]_- &= [-\zeta D - (m+1)\zeta'](L_-) - L_-[-\zeta D + m\zeta'] \\
&\equiv (\delta_\zeta U_{2m+2})D^{-1} + (\delta_\zeta U_{2m+3})D^{-2} + (\delta_\zeta U_{2m+4})D^{-3} + (\delta_\zeta U_{2m+5})D^{-4} + \dots
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.10}
$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\zeta U_{2m+2} &= [-U_{2m+2}D + 2U_{2m+3}]\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta U_{2m+3} &= [-(m+1)U_{2m+2}D^2 + U_{2m+3}D - U'_{2m+3}]\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta U_{2m+4} &= [-(m+1)U_{2m+2}D^3 - U_{2m+3}D^2 - (U'_{2m+4} - 2U_{2m+5})]\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta U_{2m+5} &= [(m+1)U_{2m+2}D^4 + mU_{2m+3}D^3 - (m+2)U_{2m+4}D^2 + U_{2m+5}D - U'_{2m+5}]\zeta
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Combining (4.9) and (4.11) we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\zeta W_{2m+2} &= 2W_{2m+3}\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta W_{2m+3} &= [-(m+1)W_{2m+2}D^2 + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+2}D - \frac{1}{2}W''_{2m+2}]\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta W_{2m+4} &= 2W_{2m+5}\zeta - \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}W_{2m+2}[m(m+1)D^3 + 2T]\zeta \\
\delta_\zeta W_{2m+5} &= [-(m+2)W_{2m+4}D^2 + \frac{1}{2}W'_{2m+4}D - \frac{1}{2}W''_{2m+4}]\zeta \\
&\quad + \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}W_{2m+3}[m(m+1)D^3 + 2T]\zeta \\
&\quad + \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}W_{2m+2}[-JD^2 + \frac{1}{2}J'D - \frac{1}{2}J'']\zeta
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

As expected, W_{2m+2} and W_{2m+3} indeed form an $N = 2$ supermultiplet, while $\delta_\zeta W_{2m+4}$ and $\delta_\zeta W_{2m+5}$ both contain some unwanted terms. Therefore we have to consider the redefinitions (4.5). In fact, we find

$$\delta_\zeta \bar{W}_{2m+4} = 2\bar{W}_{2m+5}\zeta + 2(a-b)JW_{2m+3}\zeta + [a - \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)}](\delta_\zeta J)W_{2m+2} \tag{4.13}$$

Hence, the only choice is

$$a = b = \frac{2(m+1)}{m(2m+3)} \tag{4.14}$$

With this choice we verify

$$\delta_\zeta \bar{W}_{2m+5} = [-(m+2)\bar{W}_{2m+4}D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{W}'_{2m+4}D - \frac{1}{2}\bar{W}''_{2m+4}]\zeta \tag{4.15}$$

as we wished.

We thus have identified the first two $N = 2$ supermultiplets in the negative part of L. It is natural to expect that all desired supermultiplets actually exist.

Finally, we like to present an observation on this identification problem. We shall show that if all required $N = 2$ supermultiplets can be defined when the leading order is $2m + 1$ (m can be either positive or negative), then they can also be defined when the leading order is $-2m-1$. For definiteness we assume for a moment that $m > 0$. We use the notataions defined by (3.12) and (3.15) and impose the condition (3.13). We have observed in the previous section that (3.13) is invariant under superconformal transformation. We now recast this statement by means of the super Virasoro flows defined by the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket. Let $\delta_\xi^\pm L^\pm$ denote the super Virasoro flows generated by $T^\pm$ via the respective second Gelfand-Dickey bracket. Then (3.13) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\xi^+ L^- &= -L^-(\delta_\xi^+ L^+)L^- \\
&= -L^-\big[(\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D + \frac{m+1}{2}\xi'')L^+ - L^+(\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D - \frac{m}{2}\xi'')\big]L^- \\
&= [\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D + \frac{(-m-1)+1}{2}\xi'']L^- - L^-[\xi D^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi' D - \frac{(-m-1)}{2}\xi''] \\
&= \delta_\xi^- L^-
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

The fact that $T^- = T^+$ together with (4.16) lead to the statement that under the identification (3.13) the $N = 1$ primary fields which appear in the superconformally covariant form of L^+ are still primary fields even when the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket of L^- is used instead. As a consequence, decompositions of the coefficients U_k^+'s into $N = 1$ primary fields immediately induce decompositions of U_k^-'s by the use of (3.13). Next we consider the spin-1 flows which we shall denote by $\delta_\zeta^\pm L^\pm$. Repeating the above steps yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\zeta^+ L^- &= -L^-(\delta_\zeta^+ L^+)L^- \\
&= [-\zeta D + m\zeta']L^- - L^-[-\zeta D - (m+1)\zeta'] \\
&= \delta_\zeta^- L^-
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Now since $J^- = -J^+$ we conclude that the second Gelfand-Dickey brackets of L^+ and L^- both lead to the same spin-1 flow (up to an overall sign) when the functional $H^+ = \int_B J^+\zeta$

is used in either bracket. More explicitly, what we have shown so far is that for any functional F:

$$\begin{aligned} \{F, T^-(X)\}^- &= \{F, T^+(X)\}^+ = \{F, T^-(X)\}^+ \\ \{F, J^-(X)\}^- &= \{F, J^+(X)\}^+ = -\{F, J^-(X)\}^+ \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where $\{,\}^\pm$ denote the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket of $L^\pm$ respectively. It is clear now that if W_{2k} and W_{2k+2} form an $N = 2$ supermultiplet with respect to $\{,\}^+$ then they will also do with respect to $\{,\}^-$. Therefore, once the required $N = 2$ supermultiplets have been identified for L^+ the corresponding task for L^- is automatically done. Interchanging the roles of L^+ and L^- obviously give the proof for $m < 0$. This completes the proof for the above claim.

V. Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have discussed the $N = 2$ superalgebras arising from the second Gelfand-Dickey bracket of superpseudodifferential operators. We find that the forms of several formulae derived previously for the case of superdifferential remain unchanged in this case. In other words, the generalization is pretty straightforward. For example, the formulae (3.30) and (3.31) obtained in refs.[27,28] immediately give us the superconformally covariant form of superpseudodifferential operators. Hence, the biggest problem regarding the spectrum of these superalgebras is still the identifications of $N = 2$ supermultiplets. Since the positive part and the negative part of a superpseudodifferential operator transform independently under the super Virasoro flow as well as the spin-1 flow, unless the identification problem can be solved for pure superdifferential the resolution of this problem in the present case is not possible. We like to remark that in refs.[27,29] it is observed that when $L = D^5 + U_2 D^3 + \ldots + U_5$ the $N = 1$ primary fields arising from the Drinfeld-Sokolov type matrix formalation[29,30] form precisely the desired $N = 2$ supermultiplets. One might suspect that the matrix formulation might be helpful to this problem. Hence, it seems worthwhile to discuss the spin-1 flow in the context of matrix

formultion. Finally, we like to remark that it would be interesting to investigate all possible reductions, contractions and trunctions of these $W_{KP}^{(n)}$-type superalgebras. Hopefully, some interesting W_∞-type superalgebras can emerge. Work in this direction is in progress.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Science Council of Republic of China under Grant No. NSC-83-0208-007-008.

References

[1] A.B. Zamolochikov, Theor. Math. Phys. **65**, 1205 (1985).

[2] J.-L. Gervais, Phys. Lett. **160B**, 277 (1985).

[3] J.-L. Gervais and A. Neveu, Nucl. Phys. **B264**, 557(1986).

[4] T.G. Khovanova, Funct. Anal. Appl. **21**, 332 (1987).

[5] P. Mathieu, Phys. Lett. **208B**, 101 (1988).

[6] I. Bakas, Nucl. Phys. **302**, 189 (1988); Phys. Lett. **213B**, 313 (1988).

[7] Q. Wang, P.K. Panigraphi, U. Sukhatme and W.-K. Keung, Nucl. Phys. **B344**, 194 (1990).

[8] I.M. Gelfand and L.A. Dickey, Funct. Anal. Appl. **11**, 93 (1977).

[9] M. Adler, Invent. Math. **50**, 219 (1979).

[10] B.A. Kuperschmidt and G. Wilson, Invent. Math. **62**, 403 (1981).

[11] L.A. Dickey, Ann. NY Acad. Sci. **491**, 131 (1987).

[12] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill, J. Mas and E. Ramos, Phys. Lett. **266B**, 298 (1991).

[13] A. Das and W.-J. Huang and S. Panda, Phys. Lett. **271B**, 109 (1991).

[14] A.O. Radul in: Applied methods of nonlinear analysis and control, eds. A. Mironov, V. Moroz and M. Tshernjatin(MGU, Moscow 1987)[in Russian].

[15] A. Das and W.-J. Huang, J. Math. Phys. **33**, 2487 (1992).

[16] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill, J. Mas and E. Ramos, Phys. Lett. **262B**, 265 (1991).

[17] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill and E. Ramos, Nucl. Phys. **B368**, 361 (1991).

[18] K. Huitu and D. Nemeschansky, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6**, 3179 (1991); C.M. Yung and R.C. Warner, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 4050 (1993).

[19] F. Yu, J. Math. Phys. **33**, 3180 (1992).

[20] A. Das and W.-J. Huang, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A7**, 2159 (1992).

[21] C.M. Yung, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8**, 129 (1993).

[22] E. Ramos and S. Stanciu, " On the supersymmetric BKP-hierarchy", preprint QMW-PH-94-3 (hep-th/9402056).

[23] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill, J. Mas and E. Ramos, A one-parameter family of hamiltonian structures of the KP hierarchy and a continuous deformation of the W_{KP} algebra, preprint BONN-HE-92-20, US-FT-92/7, KUL-TF-922/20 (hep-th/9207092).

[24] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill, J. Mas and E. Ramos, Phys. Lett. **299B**, 41 (1993).

[25] P. Di Francesco, C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, Comm. Math. Phys. **140**, 543 (1991).

[26] W.-J. Huang, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 993 (1994).

[27] F. Gieres and S. Theisen, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 5964 (1993).

[28] W.-J. Huang, Superconformal covariantization of superdifferential operators on (1|1) superspace and classical N=2 W-superalgebras, to appear in J. Math. Phys. (hep-th/9310192).

[29] F. Gieres and S. Theisen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9**, 383 (1994).

[30] V.G. Drinfeld and V.V. Sokolov, J. Sov. Math. **30**, 1975 (1985).